DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1.   This action is responsive to amendment filed on August 5, 2008, where applicant

amended claims 1-4,6-16,18,20. Claims 1-18,20-22 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   The objection to the drawings and specification are withdrawn.

3.   Applicant's amendments filed on 8/5/2008 and Applicants arguments in view of said

amendments have been fully considered and are persuasive. The previous prior art rejections are

withdrawn. The previous 101 rejections are withdrawn. However, Applicant's arguments are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-7,9-14,16,17,20-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Heikes et al (US Patent Publication No 2003/0222907) in view of Lango et al (US

Patent No 6,813,690).

6.   ***In reference to independent claim 1***, Heikes teaches a method of communicating object

data requested by an instant messaging application executed on an instant messaging platform,

the method comprising:

generating, at a client computing device running the instant messaging application, a

unique hash value of a fixed length based on the object data, the object data representing a

remote user in the instant messaging application and comprising metadata descriptive of the

object data (¶s 68 and 72-73),

storing the object data at a storage location in the local cache of the client computing

device, wherein the location of the object data in the local cache corresponds to the hash value

(¶s 68 and 72-73); and

returning an object name of the object data to the instant messaging application, the

object name comprising the hash value and the location field and enabling access of the object

data in the local cache by the instant messaging application without the object data being altered

at the client computing, device (¶s 68 and 72-73) .

Heikes fails to explicitly teach wherein the metadata comprises:

a hash field storing the generated hash value; a location field storing a location identifier

indicative of a location of the object data other than a location in a local cache of the client

computing device; and a type field indicating an object type which has been previously selected

by the remote user to uniquely represent the remote user during future sessions of the instant

messaging application. However, Lango discloses referencing objects in response to client

request (column 15 lines 22-27). Lango teaches an object identifier is a generated hash value of

an object name which is a concatenation of descriptive information (i.e. metadata), and includes

location and type information (column 16 lines 1-18 & 22-29). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Heikes wherein the metadata comprises: a hash field storing the generated hash value; a location field storing a location identifier indicative of a location of the object data other than a location in a local cache of the client computing device; and a type field indicating an object type which has been previously selected by the remote user to uniquely represent the remote user during future sessions of the instant messaging application. One would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of enhancing referencing locally stored objects that have been requested by remote clients.

7.   In reference to claim 2, Heikes teaches a method as recited in claim 1 further comprising: receiving a request for the object data from the instant messaging application, the request including the object name; and retrieving the object data from the local cache of the computing device wherein the object data is located based on the hash value in the object data (¶ 68).

8.   In reference to claim 3, Heikes teaches a method as recited in claim 1 further comprising: receiving a request for the object data from the instant messaging application, the request including the object name; and in response to receiving the request, retrieving the object data from the location using the location identifier (¶68).

9.   In reference to claim 4, Heikes teaches a method as recited in claim 1 further comprising: receiving a request for the object data from the instant messaging application, the request including the object name; and determining whether the requested object data is in a local cache based on the hash value; and if the requested object data is in the local cache, retrieving the object data from the local cache, otherwise, retrieving the requested object data from the location identified by the location identifier (¶s 68 and 72-73).

10.   In reference to claim 5, Heikes teaches a method as recited in claim 4 wherein the

retrieving the requested object data from the location identified by the location identifier

comprises: retrieving the requested object data from network storage (¶s 68 and 72-73).

11.   In reference to claim 6, Heikes teaches a method as recited in claim 4 wherein the

retrieving the requested object data from the location identified by the location identifier

comprises: retrieving the requested object data from a local client computing device (¶68).

12.   In reference to claim 7, Heikes teaches a method as recited in claim 4 wherein the

retrieving the requested object data from the location identified by the location identifier

comprises: retrieving the requested object data from file system remote of the client computing

device. (¶s 68 and 72-73)

13.   In reference to claim 9, Heikes teaches a method as recited in claim 7 wherein the

retrieving the requested object data from the file system remote of the client device comprises:

accessing the remote file system via a connection through a switchboard server (¶s 68 and 72-

73).

14.   Claims 10-18,20-22 correspond to claims 1-9 and are slight variations thereof. Therefore

claims 10-18,20-22 are rejected based upon the same rationale as given for claims 1-9.

Conclusion

15.   The above rejections are based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims.
Applicant is advised that the specified citations of the relied upon prior art, in the above
rejections, are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that any other supportive
sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures, incorporation by references,
claims and/or priority documents) is implied as being applied to teach the scope of the claims.

16.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. See attached Form 892.

17.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to RAMY M. OSMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-4008.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ramy M Osman/   October 22, 2008
Examiner, Art Unit 2457